

August 9, 1967

A 4035

The Kee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is our space program.

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The tragic death last January of three astronauts in a spacecraft fire set off a searching review of our entire space program which is still underway.

I believe this pause is widely approved by the public. Certainly, every engineering defect should be remedied and the margin for human error reduced to a minimum before brave men once again try to conquer the skies in their tiny spacecraft.

But while this engineering review is underway, and manned flights have been temporarily suspended, this is a good time to examine the entire space program and the reason for its existence.

The outer space program costs money, lots of money. It is, in fact, one of the most expensive programs ever undertaken by Uncle Sam and the cost will increase as the Apollo Moonflight Program gets into full swing. There are many who believe these costs should be drastically reduced and the money spent instead on an expanded War on Poverty. Behind this idea is the mistaken belief that the exploration of outer space is nothing more than a prestige race with Soviet Russia.

Let me emphasize that this view is entirely wrong. The space race is more than a luxury. It is, in fact, a grim military necessity, the neglect of which would threaten the survival of the United States. A distinguished citizen recently offered the best yardstick for measuring its worth. He said the real test is not what the project costs, but what the cost would be if we failed to compete.

The answer is obvious. Within a few years, manned platforms will orbit the globe. If they carried Communist nuclear weapons, these flying platforms could be the most devastating weapons in human history.

It was disclosed recently that President Johnson believes the pictures already taken by our space satellites are almost priceless from the standpoint of military intelligence. Since it started about ten years ago, the space program has cost about \$40 billion. The Chief Executive believes that the pictures we now have may be worth ten times that amount in terms of national safety. That both the United States and Soviet Russia employ these high-flying camera spies is an open secret.

Before the advent of the satellites, this country was forced to rely on other methods of obtaining intelligence. You may recall that an airplane called the U-2, while engaged in an intelligence mission, was shot down over Russia about seven years ago. If you wonder why such projects are necessary, the answer is easy. It was another of these high-flying planes which a few years later spotted the Soviet missile build-up in Cuba and alerted this country to the gravest danger in American history.

Our military intelligence experts now face the problem of estimating what warlike preparations, aimed at our country, are taking place behind the iron curtain. The satellite spy pictures disclosed that many previous estimates were far off. The result was we were doing many things which were unneeded

and neglecting other things which needed to be done. This situation has been corrected.

The space program will produce many peacetime benefits of great value to all mankind. But its primary purpose is to save our country from destruction.

Thank you for listening.

ABM

"No Defense" McNamara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of World War II we changed the name of our Department of War to the Department of Defense. It now appears that Mr. McNamara might have another change in mind, for he consistently refused to aid the defense of our country by carefully avoiding for quite some time installation of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system. Such a position is so ludicrous as to be almost beyond the power of words to describe, but the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune sums it up pretty well:

"NO DEFENSE" McNAMARA

One of the more curious aspects of life in the nuclear age is the effort expended by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to avoid installing an anti-ballistic missile defense system that has cost the United States 4 billion dollars to develop.

At his instigation, American diplomats are now busily engaged in trying to persuade the Russians that it is to the mutual advantage of both nations not to deploy ABM defenses even though the Soviet Union is installing a vast one called the Tallinn system. McNamara would have the Russians junk it.

In McNamara's strategy, the best defense is no defense at all. Commitment to build an ABM, his theory holds, would accelerate the arms race, thereby reducing a nation's security as the enemy rushes to adopt counter-measures. An ABM system, of course, is purely defensive.

According to McNamara logic, the thing to do is to stop the arms race by putting a Soviet-American "freeze" on ABM systems. Then neither nation would have a defense system against an enemy's missiles. The flaw in this military LSD trip is that the Russians are having no part of it. According to the American Security Council, they abandoned the "no defense" nonsense years ago.

In a recent study on the military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. prepared for the House armed services committee a special committee of council defense experts, including 14 retired generals and admirals, exploded some of the myths about the ABM.

They recalled the report of Charles M. Herzfeld, director of the advanced research projects agency of the department of defense, to a European study commission conference in London on Jan. 15, 1966, a year before McNamara's band started its ABM "freeze" talks with the Communists.

Herzfeld told the Europeans that the United States argument against deploying ABMs because they would only accelerate the arms race was first put to the Russians "at least three Pugwash conferences ago." These are international meetings of world scientists, named for the first conference, held at Pugwash, N.S., in 1957.

On the first two occasions, said Herzfeld, "the Russians did not even understand the argument that there might be an advantage

in not having a defense." The Russians aren't the only ones who don't. A number of American military experts can't understand this notion either.

The third time American scientists advanced this theory the Russians had an answer. This time, Herzfeld reported, the Russians said "it was too late." As American intelligence agencies learned later, the Russians by then were well along in deploying their first ABMs.

As the American Security Council committee observed, they had "already opted for acceleration," not only thru their ABM system but by increasing their force of intercontinental ballistic missiles and developing a nuclear submarine strike force able to deliver missiles on American cities. Meanwhile, McNamara sits around waiting for them to see the light.

Poverty War Halves Youth Crime Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article from the July 31, 1967, Corpus Christi Times entitled "Poverty War Halves Youth Crime Here." The source of this information is a man who certainly should know, Sgt. C. B. Mauricio, head of the police juvenile bureau. Speaking of the decrease in juvenile crime Sergeant Mauricio reports that "We first noticed it last year when the summer activities of the poverty program were in full swing. But this year the results are nothing short of fantastic. I would say that juvenile crime in general has been cut in half by the OEO."

Mr. Speaker, with the current rash of irresponsible charges and vague rumors that OEO is financing civil disturbance and creating conditions which foster disrespect for law and order, it is indeed refreshing to see law officers testify to the proven effectiveness of OEO programs in decreasing crime.

The article follows:

POVERTY WAR HALVES YOUTH CRIME HERE--
COMPLAINTS FROM WORST AREAS RARE NOW,
JUVENILE BUREAU SAYS

(By Bill Walraven)

Juvenile crime has been cut in half by the war on poverty, Sgt. C. B. Mauricio, head of the Police Juvenile Bureau, said today.

"We first noticed it last year when the summer activities of the poverty program were in full swing," Mauricio said. "But this year the results are nothing short of fantastic. I would say that juvenile crime in general has been cut in half by the OEO."

The greatest decline has been in poverty areas where summer programs are in effect, "but the Southside has dropped radically, too, because of the large number of teenagers there who are involved in the summer activities in one way or the other."

He said juvenile crime increased briefly at the end of school, but by the end of 30 days when poverty programs began functioning fully, there was a very sharp decline in the number of calls for Juvenile Bureau detectives, he said.

"The La Armada area used to give us fits," he said. "Now with all the Boy's Club activities, there crime activity is almost at a standstill. A few bikes have been stolen, and that has been the extent of the crime. Even

August 9, 1967

A 4036

the glue-sniffing has disappeared, Mauricio said.

The Meadow Park area "is a center where the effects are really being felt. This was an area where glue sniffing was popular, where they hid under buildings and back in dark corners.

"We had been getting calls from schools where boys were hanging around with nothing else to do. These calls are pretty rare now, because the Meadow Park Center is active and they have the programs at the swimming pool.

"In the Molina area we had a lot of trouble with gang fights, boys picking on girls, of entry into vacant houses. Now they are going to the center there and they have a good program for them."

He said the work programs seem to be producing the most remarkable results. "We've got kids working who never knew what it was to earn a dollar before. We've got a lot of others waiting to get on. Some of them are working as swimming supervisors with no pay, just for the prestige.

"I will say that most of our calls today are on repeater types. These are the guys who will not take part in anything. But we're beginning to draw a few even from this group.

"The knife fight and the weapons ordinance violators and the serious types of assaults are at a minimum. These programs are allowing some of them to become accustomed to being around others. Every time they met before, there was a clash."

He said that the neighborhood center at Leathers housing unit "is buzzing all the time. We used to get calls there all the time to quieten some sort of troublemaker. Now there is supervision and the kids themselves are helping police it."

As for the neighborhood gangs that cropped up in about half a dozen of the deep poverty areas which are Corpus Christi's equivalent to the big city ghettos "where you have rent houses jammed together and families of 10 and 12 living in two-room houses," Mauricio said, "there is no trace of them at all. As far as we can see they just aren't there any more."

The summer programs should show up in fewer referrals by the juvenile detectives to the Juvenile Department and a sharp decrease in serious cases, he said.

Vietnam and the Sickness of the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. MORTON, Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of this House feels keenly a responsibility to search out the underlying weakness in our society which has produced across this great land shameful riots and displays of mass civil disobedience accompanied by a great destruction of property and even of human life.

Undoubtedly, the answer lies in our failure to establish realistic priorities in the programs we use to govern ourselves.

Where is the national interest? Is it at home in the environment of our civilization? Or is it on the moon? Or is it in the deserts of Egypt? Or is it in the villages of Southeast Asia?

Where do we compare the building of our civilization with our responsibility

to defend it? These are the searching questions of the day.

The editorial of August 4 in the Wall Street Journal may be helpful in developing a better understanding even if it is only an understanding of the fact that something is wrong:

VIETNAM AND THE SICKNESS OF THE CITIES

There is a growing feeling that the nation's domestic problems are so grievous it should not be heavily involved abroad, particularly in Vietnam. While it is easy to sympathize with the sentiment, it can lead to some wrong conclusions.

As an indication of the attitude, President Johnson was asked at a news conference if we shouldn't rethink our priorities spending more on the homefront and less in Southeast Asia. He replied that the U.S. is rich enough to meet its responsibilities at home without neglecting its responsibilities in the world.

This seems to us to miss the point. We doubt that the U.S. Government is in fact "rich" enough to mount costly new programs for the cities while pouring some \$25 billion a year into the war in Vietnam. The Federal budgetary position is extremely bad; even if taxes are increased, it threatens worse inflation and an undermining of the dollar, which certainly is no help for poor people or anyone else.

In any case, the Federal programs for the cities, and the heavy spending so far, have largely failed, as the riots and continuing physical decay attest. If the U.S. could somehow be relieved of its Vietnam cross; a hopeful course for aiding the cities and easing racial tensions would be to inject money into the private economy through lower Federal spending and tax reductions. That is how jobs are created, and job-creation is what has given prosperity to the great majority of Americans, including many Negroes.

More promising than additional Federal intervention in the cities is the approach taken by 22 prominent Americans who are setting up an emergency convocation in Washington later this month. Calling itself the Urban Coalition, the group includes I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers, banker David Rockefeller and Mayors Joseph Barr of Pittsburgh and John Lindsay of New York.

The Urban Coalition also talks of revising national—presumably having in mind too many foreign entanglements—priorities and bringing more resources to bear on domestic problems. It wants Federal action, but at least it makes the important point that the private economy "must directly and vigorously involve itself in the crisis of the cities." It calls for "investments, job training and hiring and all other things that are necessary to the full employment of the free enterprise system, and also to its survival."

Given the present oppressive taxation and numerous governmental hobbles on business, it is only realistic to acknowledge a limit on how much more free enterprise can accomplish in the cities. Yet the Coalition is right in saying it can and should contribute to improving the political, social, economic and moral climate.

What the group calls the sickness of the cities suggests a couple of further comments on the connection between Vietnam and America's domestic difficulties.

The riots, and especially the rantings of the black-racist fanatics, are of course damaging the country's prestige all over the world. Specifically the question is being raised, and not only by foreigners, whether a nation having so much trouble running itself should be trying to save an embryonic nation half a world away and build it into a real nation. Whether, indeed, the U.S. any longer has the moral authority for that task.

The question is unfair, overlooking the fact that the riots are aberrations brought

on by agitators and criminals, whereas public policy and most public opinion favors improving the economic as well as the legal lot of the Negro insofar as possible. Still, we would agree to this extent: If and when the U.S. ever gets free of Vietnam, it should concentrate on making America a better place for its citizens and worry less about saving every last piece of foreign real estate from communism.

In the final analysis, however, sound judgments on Vietnam cannot turn on civic disorder at home. If it is deemed necessary to the national security to resist communism in Vietnam, it should be done regardless of the domestic disarray. If it was not essential, then the U.S. should have foregone the involvement for that reason alone.

The trouble is that even before this summer's outbreaks of violence, many Americans felt that large-scale intervention in Vietnam probably was not essential to the national interest. Logical or not, the riots can only make them more dissatisfied than ever with that dismal enterprise.

Options in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 9, 1967

Mr. COHELAN, Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have urged the United States to initiate new efforts, to search for new options that could lead to a deescalation of the war in Vietnam, and to a peaceful settlement of this costly conflict. On May 4, in a speech to the House, I urged that we stay further military escalation and intensify, instead, the diplomatic, economic and nation-building initiatives that could bring about a cease-fire and honorable peace.

An editorial in the New York Times, which appeared last June 4, and a letter to the editor of the Times by Prof. James C. Thomson, Jr., appearing in the same edition, point out that constructive alternatives to military escalation have been and may still be available. An article by Tom Wicker, also appearing in the same issue of the Times, makes clear that the cost of the war continues or grows.

Mr. Speaker, these are timely and thoughtful contributions to our discussion and understanding of Vietnam policy, and I include them with my remarks.

UNTREED OPTIONS IN VIETNAM

The Johnson Administration has increasingly challenged the assertions of its critics that there are—or have ever been—valid alternatives to the dangerous and unsuccessful policy of escalation it has been pursuing in Vietnam since February 1965.

A letter on the opposite page from Prof. James C. Thomson Jr. of Harvard, staff assistant to McGeorge Bundy, then the President's adviser for national security affairs, makes it clear that "constructive alternatives" were repeatedly proposed not only outside the Government but also inside, by the Administration's own experts. Unfortunately, they were unheeded.

The tragic turning point came between Election Day in November 1964, and February 1965. The policy of the Johnson Presidential campaign was reversed. An opportunity to open direct secret talks with Hanoi was rejected. Instead, the decision was made